1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA JAMES D. MACIEL, 10 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-02-0144 DFL JFM P 12 VS. V. SANCHEZ, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 **ORDER** 15 16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action 17 seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate 18 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262. 19 On September 9, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations 20 herein which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections 21 to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. The findings and 22 recommendations specifically provided that no extensions of time would be granted. On October 23 3, 2005, plaintiff filed a request for an extension of time to file objections. After review of the 24 ///// 25 26 ¹ The request for extension of time and the certificate of service appended thereto are

¹ The request for extension of time and the certificate of service appended thereto are dated September 24, 2005. The reason for the nine day delay between that date and the date on which the document was filed in this court is not apparent.

Case 2:02-cv-00144-DFL-JFM Document 51 Filed 11/14/05 Page 2 of 2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

record herein, and good cause appearing, plaintiff's request for an extension of time to file objections will be denied. In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's October 3, 2005 request for an extension of time is denied; 2. The findings and recommendations filed September 9, 2005, are adopted in full; and 3. This court finds that plaintiff's proposed second amended complaint contains no cognizable claim for relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and this action shall therefore remain closed. DATED: 11/11/2005 DAVID F. LEVI United States District Judge /maci0144.805